

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION Washington, DC 20463

Lawrence H. Norton, Esq. William A. Powers, Esq. Venable LLP 575 Seventh Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004

DEC 1 3 2016

RE:

MUR 7072

Kanta Bera

Dear Messrs. Norton and Powers:

On May 26, 2016, the Federal Election Commission notified your client, Kanta Bera, of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. A copy of the complaint was forwarded to your client at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint, information supplied by you, and other information, the Commission, on December 6, 2016, voted to dismiss this matter. The Factual and Legal Analysis, which more fully explains the Commission's decision, is enclosed for your information.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Other Matters, 81 Fed. Reg. 50,702 (Aug. 2, 2016).

If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Mark Allen

Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure
Factual and Legal Analysis

22

1	FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
2	FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS
4 5 6	RESPONDENT: Kanta Bera MUR: 7072
7 8	I. INTRODUCTION
9	The Complaint in this matter is based on a guilty plea filed in Federal District Court by
10	Babulal Bera, father of U.S. Representative Amerish "Ami" Bera ("Rep. Bera"), in which
11	Babulal Bera admitted making approximately \$270,000 in contributions in the names of about 90
12	other individuals to Ami Bera for Congress (the "Committee") during the 2010 and 2012 election
13	cycles. 1 Kanta Bera is Babulal Bera's wife and the mother of Rep. Bera.
14	For the reasons set forth below, the Commission dismisses the Complaint as to Kanta
15	Bera. <sup>2</sup>
16	II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND
17	Representative Ami Bera (CA-7) ran unsuccessfully for Congress in 2010, won his seat
18	in 2012, and was re-elected in 2014 and 2016. On May 10, 2016, Babulal Bera pleaded guilty to
19	violating 52 U.S.C. §§ 30116(a)(1)(A) and 30122 by making contributions in the names of others
20	and making excessive contributions during the 2010 and 2012 election cycles. <sup>3</sup> According to the
21	Factual Basis for Pleas, Babulal Bera reimbursed approximately 90 contributors who made more

than 130 contributions to the Committee.4

Compl. At I, Ex. A (May 23, 2016). Ami Bera for Congress is Ami Bera's principal campaign committee.

See Heckler v, Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).

Plea Agreement, *United States v. Bera*, No. 2:16-cr-00097 (E.D. Cal. May 10, 2016) ("Plea Agmt."). On August 18, 2016, Babulal Bera was sentenced to a prison term of one year and one day, supervised release for a term of 36 months, and a criminal fine of \$100,000. Judgment, *United States v. Babulal Bera*, No. 2:16-cr-00097 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2016).

Plea Agmt. Ex. A (Factual Basis for Pleas).

MUR 7072 (Kanta Bera) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 2 of 5

. 17

The Factual Basis for Pleas states that, during the 2010 election cycle, Babulal and Kanta Bera each made the maximum allowable contribution to the Committee for the primary and general elections — then a total of \$4,800 — between April 4, 2009, and May 4, 2009. Babulal Bera then "directly and indirectly solicited relatives, friends and acquaintances to make the maximum allowable federal campaign contribution [to the Committee], with the understanding that he would reimburse them in whole or in part." From approximately May 11, 2009, through at least August 20, 2010, these individuals contributed a total of approximately \$225,326 to the Committee. Babulal Bera provided full or partial refunds to these individuals totaling more than \$220,000.8

According to the Factual Basis for Pleas, Babulal Bera conducted a similar scheme during the 2012 election cycle. On approximately January 5, 2011, Babulal and Kanta Bera each contributed the maximum allowable amount for the primary and general elections — then \$5,000 — to the Committee. Babulal Bera again solicited family, friends, and acquaintances to make the maximum allowable contribution to the Committee with the understanding that he would reimburse the conduits for their donations. The plea agreement indicates that from at least January 31, 2011, through at least December 5, 2011, these individuals contributed a total of approximately \$43,400 to the Committee. Between April 26, 2011, and at least June 9, 2012, these individuals received full reimbursements for their contributions from Babulal Bera,

*Id*.

*Id*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Id.

Id.

Id.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> *Id*.

II *Id*.

13

14

15

16

17

MUR 7072 (Kanta Bera) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 3 of 5

- 1 which were delivered either by Babulal Bera himself or through third parties working at his
- 2 behest.<sup>12</sup>
- In the joint Response of Kanta and Babulal Bera, they acknowledge Babulal's plea
- 4 agreement, but argue that in light of his taking "full responsibility for his conduct," the
- 5 Commission should dismiss the Complaint as a matter of prosecutorial discretion. 13 They
- 6 contend that "Mr. Bera's acceptance of responsibility, remorse, age, and health issues, along with
- 7 his lack of prior experience making political contributions" support dismissal. 14 They ask that
- 8 the Complaint's allegations against Kanta Bera also be dismissed on the grounds that the cited
- 9 news articles suggesting her involvement in the scheme are "devoid of any facts that suggest
- 10 Mrs. Bera violated the Act."15
- According to press accounts, DOJ announced on September 16, 2016, that no other
- 12 charges would be sought in the Babulal Bera matter. 16

## III. LEGAL ANALYSIS

In the 2010 election cycle, the Act prohibited an individual from making contributions to a candidate which, in the aggregate, exceeded \$2,400 per election.<sup>17</sup> In the 2012 cycle, the contribution limit was \$2,500 per election.<sup>18</sup> The Act further provides that no person shall make a contribution in the name of another or knowingly permit his name to be used to effect such a

Information ¶13, United States v. Babulal Bera, No. 2:16-cr-00097 (E.D. Cal. May 9, 2016) ("Information").

Bera Supp. Resp. at 1.

Id. The Response notes that Babulal and Kanta Bera are 83 and 82 years old, respectively. Id.

<sup>15</sup> Id. at 8.

See Denny Walsh, No Election Fraud Charges Against Ami Bera, Says U.S. Justice Department, SACRAMENTO BEE, Sept. 16, 2016, available at ttp://www.sacbee.com/news/local/crime/article102224787.html.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 30116(a)(1)(A).

<sup>18</sup> Id. See 11 C.F.R. § 110.1(b)(1).

MUR 7072 (Kanta Bera) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 4 of 5

1 contribution, and that no person shall knowingly accept a contribution in the name of another. 19

2 It also constitutes a violation of the Act to help or assist any person in making a contribution in

3 the name of another.<sup>20</sup>

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Babulal Bera admits in his plea agreement that he knowingly and willfully engaged in a scheme to make excessive contributions in the names of others to his son's campaign committee during two successive election cycles. <sup>21</sup> Specifically, he admits that after he reached his individual contribution limit to the Committee for the 2010 and 2012 election cycles, he "directly and indirectly" solicited approximately 90 other individuals to make contributions to the Committee in their own names, with the promise that he would reimburse them for their donations. <sup>22</sup> Bera also admits that he reimbursed his conduits, in whole or in part. In total, he reimbursed more than \$220,000 in contributions to the Committee during the 2010 election cycle and \$43,400 in contributions to the Committee during the 2012 election cycle.

In stating that he solicited conduits "directly and indirectly," Babulal Bera's plea agreement suggests that, in addition to the conduits themselves, others may have helped or assisted in his scheme.<sup>23</sup> In that agreement, the Department of Justice ("DOJ") stated that it "did not intend to prosecute the defendant's wife, Kanta Bera."<sup>24</sup> As noted, DOJ reportedly closed the investigation without charging any other person.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> 52 U.S.C. § 30122.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> 11 C.F.R. § 110.4(b)(1)(iii).

See generally Information; Plea Agmt. Ex. A.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Id.

Plea Agreement, *United States v. Bera*, No. 2:16-cr-00097 (E.D. Cal. May 10, 2016) ("Plea Agmt.") Ex. A (Factual Basis for Pleas).

Plea Agmt at 6.

MUR 7072 (Kanta Bera) Factual and Legal Analysis Page 5 of 5

- 1 The Commission has determined as a matter of prosecutorial discretion to dismiss the
- 2 allegations against Kanta Bera in view of the lack of information directly suggesting that she
- 3 helped or assisted Babulal Bera make contributions in the name of another, her advanced age,
- 4 and Babulal Bera's guilty plea, prison sentence, and criminal fine. In addition, the statute of
- 5 limitations on most of the activity here has run.<sup>25</sup> Under these circumstances, the Commission
- 6 dismisses the Complaint as to Kanta Bera. See Heckler v. Chaney. 26

The statute of limitations has run on the entire \$220,000 in violation during the 2010 election cycle. As for the \$43,400 in violation from the 2012 election cycle, the plea materials provide a general range of dates and do not identify specific contributions, but it appears that a substantial portion of that activity is now also beyond the statute of limitations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> 470 U.S. 821 (1985).